



# PROGRESSIVE INTERNATIONALISM

*A Democratic National Security Strategy*



**Ronald D. Asmus**

*German Marshall Fund of the United States*

**James R. Blaker**

*Progressive Policy Institute*

**Lael Brainard**

*Brookings Institution*

**Kurt Campbell**

*Center for Strategic and International Studies*

**Gregory Craig**

*Williams & Connolly*

**Larry Diamond**

*Hoover Institution*

**Michèle A. Flournoy**

*Center for Strategic and International Studies*

**Philip H. Gordon**

*Brookings Institution*

**Edward Gresser**

*Progressive Policy Institute*

**Bob Kerrey**

*New School University*

**Will Marshall**

*Progressive Policy Institute*

**Michael McFaul**

*Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*

**Steven J. Nider**

*Progressive Policy Institute*

**Kenneth M. Pollack**

*Saban Center for Middle East Policy,*

*Brookings Institution*

**Jeremy Rosner**

*Greenberg Quinlan, Rosner Research Inc.*

The views expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of, and should not be attributed to, the authors' affiliations.

# PROGRESSIVE INTERNATIONALISM: A DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

As Democrats, we are proud of our party's tradition of tough-minded internationalism and strong record in defending America. Presidents Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman led the United States to victory in two world wars and designed the post-war international institutions that have been a cornerstone of global security and prosperity ever since. President Truman forged democratic alliances such as NATO that eventually triumphed in the Cold War. President Kennedy epitomized America's commitment to "the survival and success of liberty." Jimmy Carter placed the defense of human rights at the center of our foreign policy. And Bill Clinton led the way in building a post-Cold War Europe whole, free, and at peace in a new partnership with Russia. Around the world the names of these Democratic statesmen elicit admiration and respect.

Today America is threatened once again. Our country needs a new generation of Democratic leaders to step forward and provide the same caliber of leadership as their 20th century predecessors.

Two years ago, terrorists declared war on America by killing thousands of innocent civilians. But America was not the only target: The September 11 hijackers acted in the name of a hateful ideology inimical to the cause of liberty everywhere. Like the Cold War, the struggle we face today is likely to last not years, but decades. Once again the United States must

rally the forces of freedom and democracy around the world to defeat this new menace and build a better world.

The 21st century has brought a new set of threats whose origins are different but whose consequences are potentially as dangerous as the totalitarian challenges of the last century. We were fortunate that our terrorist enemies did not yet have the capacity to inflict catastrophic harm on us with weapons of mass destruction. Preventing a deadly fusion of terrorism and rogue states on the one hand and mass destruction weapons on the other is one of the paramount challenges of our time.

In times of danger, Americans put aside partisanship and unite in the defense of our country. That is why, as Democrats, we supported the Bush administration's toppling of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. We also backed the goal of ousting Saddam Hussein's malignant regime in Iraq, because the previous policy of containment was failing, because Saddam posed a grave danger to America as well as his own brutalized people, and because his blatant defiance of more than a decade's worth of United Nations Security Council resolutions was undermining both collective security and international law. We believed then, and we believe now, that this threat was less imminent than the administration claimed and that the United States should have done much more to win international backing and better prepare for post-war reconstruction. Nonetheless, we are

convinced that the Iraqi people, the region and the world are better off now that this barbaric dictator is gone.

At the same time, we believe President Bush is in many respects leading America in the wrong direction on national security. Having triumphed on the battlefield in both Afghanistan and Iraq, we are now in danger of losing the peace in both countries. By insisting on our right to act unilaterally, by ignoring intelligence assessments that conflicted with his desire to act, and by underestimating the resources needed to accomplish the missions, the president is putting America's battlefield gains in jeopardy. By focusing too much on U.S. military might as its main foreign policy instrument, the administration is abdicating its responsibility to fashion an effective, long-term political and economic strategy for changing the conditions in which Islamic fundamentalism breeds and from which new threats to our national security are most likely to arise. And by pushing ideologically motivated tax cuts and repudiating the nation's hard-won commitment to fiscal discipline, President Bush also is reducing our future capacity to act around the world and weakening American economic leadership and leverage.

In addition, the administration has yet to put an effective check on the dangerous nuclear ambitions of North Korea or Iran, or to make any progress toward ending the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians. On the domes-

tic front, it has failed to devote sufficient energy, focus, and resources to the pressing task of defending our homeland against another terror attack. Instead of mobilizing our friends and isolating our enemies, this administration is isolating the United States from the rest of the world, squandering the good will and alliances built up over decades by successive U.S. leaders. American military strength is at an all-time high but our moral authority around the world is at an all-time low.

---

*Progressive internationalism occupies  
the vital center between the  
neo-imperial right and the  
non-interventionist left.*

---

We recognize, however, that Democrats must do more than criticize this administration's increasingly incompetent handling of our

nation's security. That alone will do little to allay the doubts that too many Americans have about our party's willingness or ability to pursue the tough defense and security policies today's world demands. To re-establish our credibility on national security, Democrats must offer a positive vision that spells out how we would do a better job of keeping Americans safe and restoring America's capacity to lead.

We begin by reaffirming the Democratic Party's commitment to progressive internationalism—the belief that America can best defend itself by building a world safe for individual liberty and democracy. We therefore support the bold exercise of American power, not to dominate but to shape alliances and international institutions that share a common commitment to liberal values. The way to keep America safe and strong is not to impose our will on others or pursue a narrow, selfish nationalism that



betrays our best values, but to lead the world toward political and economic freedom.

While some complain that the Bush administration has been too radical in recasting America's national security strategy, we believe it has not been ambitious or imaginative enough. We need to do more, and do it smarter and better to protect our people and help shape a safer, freer world.

Progressive internationalism occupies the vital center between the neo-imperial right and the non-interventionist left, between a view that assumes that our might always makes us right and one that assumes that because America is strong it must be wrong.

Too many on the left seem incapable of taking America's side in international disputes, reflexively oppose the use of force, and begrudge the resources required to keep our military strong. Viewing multilateralism as an end in itself, they lose sight of goals, such as fighting terrorism or ending gross human rights abuses, which sometimes require us to act—if need be outside a sometimes ineffectual United Nations. And too many adopt an anti-globalization posture that would not only erode our own prosperity but also consign billions of the world's neediest people to grinding poverty. However troubling the Bush record, the pacifist and protectionist left offers no credible alternative.

Progressive internationalism stresses the responsibilities that come with our enormous power: to use force with restraint but not to hesitate to use it when necessary, to show what the Declaration of Independence called “a decent respect for the opinions of mankind,” to exercise leadership primarily through persuasion

rather than coercion, to reduce human suffering where we can, and to create alliances and international institutions committed to upholding a decent world order. We must return to four core principles that have long defined the Democratic Party's tradition of tough-minded internationalism:

- ◆ **National strength.** From Franklin Roosevelt's pledge to make America the “arsenal of democracy” to the present, Democrats have stood for a strong national defense. The armed forces that won such brilliant victories in Afghanistan and Iraq were bequeathed to the current administration by President Clinton. Democrats will maintain the world's most capable and technologically advanced military, and we will not flinch from using it to defend our interests anywhere in the world. At the same time, we recognize that America's global influence is not just a reflection of our military power. It derives as well from our nation's other strengths: a large and dynamic economy, the capacity for innovation and self-correction, energetic diplomacy and the moral allure of our founding ideals. Democrats will not neglect these vital sources of American power.
- ◆ **Liberal democracy.** Democrats believe that America should use its unparalleled power to defend our country and to shape a world in which the values of liberal democracy increasingly hold sway. History amply demonstrates that true peace and security depend not only on relations between states but also between state and society. Rulers who abuse their own people are more likely to threaten other countries, to support and spawn terrorism, to violate treaties, and

otherwise flout norms of civilized conduct. British Prime Minister Tony Blair put it succinctly in his July 2003 address to Congress: “The spread of freedom is the best security for the free. It is our last line of defense and our first line of attack.”

- ◆ **Free enterprise.** Democrats believe that economic freedom is integral to human progress. It is no accident that the world’s freest countries are also its richest countries. We stand for equal and expanding opportunity at home and abroad. That is why we favor vibrant, entrepreneurial markets, open trade, and active governance to ensure honest competition. Such conditions not only unleash the creative potential of individuals, they draw nations closer together in a web of economic interdependence. And as the world’s biggest economy, America has a vital stake in expanding a rules-based system of world commerce that ensures broadly shared prosperity while steadily lifting global labor and environmental standards.
- ◆ **World leadership.** Democrats believe energetic U.S. leadership is integral to shaping a world congenial to our interests and values. World order doesn’t emerge spontaneously; it must be organized through collective action by the leading powers, in particular the leading democracies. The main responsibility for global leadership falls on America as first among equals. But our country cannot lead if our leaders will not listen. The surest way to isolate America—and call into being anti-American coalitions—is to succumb to the imperial temptation and attempt to impose our will on others. We believe, instead, in renewing our democratic alliances to meet new threats, in

progressively enlarging the zone of market democracies by including countries that want to join, and in strengthening and reforming international institutions—the United Nations, the international financial institutions, the World Trade Organization—which, for all their obvious flaws, still embody humanity’s highest hopes for collective security and cooperative problem-solving.

In the 20th century, Democratic statesmen like Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy applied these core principles to lead America out of isolationism into world leadership. They championed democracy. They built up and used our armed forces to combat and contain fascism and communism. They expanded trade and created the world economic system that brought decades of unprecedented global prosperity. They created alliances like NATO that not only deterred the USSR but also subsequently helped to transform former adversaries into new allies. They recognized that to win the Cold War, America had to inspire not just fear in our enemies, but admiration and loyalty in our friends. To that end, they built an enduring network of alliances and institutions that shared our burdens, enlarged our influence, and encouraged other free peoples to stand with America.

That strategy led to victory in the Cold War, the consolidation of a new peace throughout Europe, and a dramatic expansion of global freedom. By the end of the 20th century, the United States was an historical rarity—a dominant power more admired than feared by others.

That is the legacy the Bush administration inherited, then squandered.

# THE REPUBLICAN FAILURE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

When America embarked on its war on global terrorism two years ago, we had enormous assets for the long struggle ahead—the support and sympathy of most of the world, sufficient resources for the task, strong bipartisan backing at home, and a patient public ready for service and sacrifice. It is shocking how quickly President Bush and his team have squandered these advantages.

Today many of our longtime allies and friends are deeply estranged from U.S. policy; the White House has weakened domestic support for its policies by pressing for maximum partisan advantage at every turn; the Pentagon's plans for rebuilding Iraq have come to grief; and, thanks to the administration's monumental fiscal mismanagement, the United States may not have the necessary resources to finish the job in Iraq or undertake a more ambitious strategy to “drain the swamp” from which terrorism arises. What's more, serious gaps remain in our homeland defenses and the Bush administration has failed abysmally to summon Americans to sacrifice and service at a time of national emergency.

To be sure, the Bush administration deserves credit for confronting America's new enemies and settling accounts with an old one. It ousted the Taliban from Afghanistan, launched the hunt for al Qaeda, and ended Saddam Hussein's tyranny and defiance of the international community. But in many serious and lasting ways,

President Bush and his advisers have weakened America's security.

## ***The High Costs of Unilateralism***

From our most important alliances in Europe to relations with our closest neighbors in Latin America, the Bush administration has gratuitously offended our democratic friends on issues important to them, prompting them to resist cooperation on matters vital to us. This is not a matter of bad manners; it is a matter of bad strategy. For without the cooperation of allies and friends, we cannot effectively meet the most critical challenges to our national security, from global terrorism to proliferation. Too many of our friends now question whether America is a reliable partner in tackling common problems.

In Afghanistan, the Administration's initial rejection of NATO support and reluctance to put more U.S. boots on the ground compromised the mission, enabling Osama bin Laden and other top al Qaeda leaders to escape. Scorning “nation building,” the White House rebuffed the new Afghan government's pleas to deploy peacekeepers around the country and create the security foundation necessary for reconstruction to succeed. Most of the country is now under the control of the same warlords whose misrule paved the way for the Taliban's rise in the 1990s. Meanwhile, elements of the Taliban have regrouped and launched attacks along the southwestern border with Pakistan

while al Qaeda has resumed its grim campaign of mass murder from Saudi Arabia to Morocco.

In Iraq, President Bush presided over a deft military campaign but then proved utterly unprepared to win the peace. Having brushed aside the advice of top military leaders and ignored the lessons learned from the past decade of post-conflict operations, the administration found itself with too few troops to prevent looting, stop sabotage and restore basic public order. The failure to find weapons of mass destruction raised public doubts about the president's rationale for the war. Compounding these doubts were subsequent disclosures that the White House manipulated intelligence reports to exaggerate Iraq's nuclear threat and insinuate a link—since disavowed by the president—between Saddam Hussein and the 9/11 terror attacks.

After prematurely declaring the end of major combat in Iraq last April, President Bush was caught off guard by continuing attacks that have claimed almost as many American lives as were lost in the war. For months, the president stubbornly refused to seek a United Nations resolution that would open the way to wider international efforts to share the costs and risks of Iraq's reconstruction. This left U.S. forces stretched thin and vulnerable not only to continuing guerrilla attacks but also to propaganda that casts them as occupiers rather than liberators. It also stuck U.S. taxpayers with a huge and

mounting bill for keeping order and rebuilding Iraq's basic infrastructure. Now, with foreign fighters crossing borders into Iraq, the administration has declared Iraq the next battleground in the war on terror. But if America is truly at war, why does the president refuse to put America on a wartime footing? Why does he not level with the public about the long-term costs of this fight? Instead, the White House persists

---

*The White House persists in the illusion that we can have it all—huge tax cuts for the wealthy, massive military spending, huge dollops of aid for rebuilding Iraq, prescription drug benefits and more—without any sacrifice from the public or adjustment of our budget priorities.*

---

in the illusion that we can have it all—huge tax cuts for the wealthy, massive military spending, huge dollops of aid for rebuilding Iraq, prescription drug benefits and more—without any sacrifice from the public or adjustment of our budget priorities. With a record shattering

\$600 billion in budget deficits looming on the horizon, Americans increasingly recognize the need to change the nation's fiscal course.

### ***The Road Map to Nowhere***

The Bush administration inherited a difficult situation in the Middle East, but its handling of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been nothing short of disastrous. As the carnage mounted on both sides, it refused to engage in attempts to revive peace negotiations until the Palestinians installed a new prime minister. When they finally did so, the administration did little to help Mahmoud Abbas consolidate his power or crush the terrorist networks. Nor did it pressure Israeli to make more than token gestures toward fulfilling its obligations under the "road map." As a result, Abbas resigned as prime



minister, the unreliable Yasser Arafat is back in full control, and the Israeli government believes it has no alternative but to proceed with unilateral methods to protect its people—such as building a security fence through the West Bank—that will only deepen Palestinian anger.

### ***Overreliance on Military Force***

The administration has disproportionately relied on military strength, disregarding the economic, political, and cultural aspects of American power, and neglecting challenges to which there is no simple military solution. The administration has failed to use non-military instruments, such as diplomacy, trade, and foreign assistance, to tackle the

conditions that enable groups like al Qaeda to garner recruits, money, and public sympathy. Its disdain for diplomacy has led the administration to consistently shortchange investments in America's "soft power"—the foreign affairs budget and accounts for foreign assistance, post-conflict reconstruction, threat reduction, and public diplomacy. As a result, we are fighting the war on terror with one hand tied behind our back. The U.S. military is doing a brilliant job, but it is inadequately supported by other instruments of our national power. Consequently, it is often asked to undertake missions for which it does not have a comparative advantage and its deployments are prolonged by the absence of the civilian capabilities and initiatives necessary to achieve our objectives.

The administration's decision to elevate preemptive military action from an option that every president has quietly reserved to a declared national security doctrine has alarmed friends

and foes alike. It has encouraged countries like Iran and North Korea to accelerate the development of nuclear weapons to deter what they now see as a potential U.S. attack. And it has provided new justification for other states, such as India and Pakistan, to launch preemptive attacks to settle their own security problems.

### ***Weak Focus on Proliferation, Homeland Security***

Keeping mass destruction weapons out of the hands of terrorists is by far the most urgent security task facing our nation's leaders. While intently focused on Iraq—where such

weapons have yet to be found—the administration has failed to stem proliferation on other key fronts. For example, the White House stood by passively as North Korea crossed what was once a clear red line: relocating and reprocessing plutonium fuel rods, putting them out of reach of both inspectors and potential military strikes and putting Pyongyang on the road to acquiring half a dozen nuclear weapons within a matter of months. Its inability to check Iran's nuclear ambitions left a vacuum that was filled by Britain, France and Germany, who won a pledge from Tehran to stop enriching uranium. It has failed to increase funding to secure Russia's vast stockpiles of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons materials, leaving them vulnerable to theft or diversion. It has done little to prevent a new arms race between India and Pakistan. In fact, America is no more secure from the danger that terrorists might get these deadly weapons than we were before 9/11.

---

*We are fighting the war on terror  
with one hand tied behind our back.*

---

More than one year ago, President Bush declared, “the U.S. government has no more important mission than protecting the homeland from future terrorist attacks.” Measured against its own standard, the White House has fallen short. Energetic in waging war overseas, the administration has been oddly lethargic in fortifying America’s defenses at home. Sparing no expense on our armed forces, the administration has begrudged America’s police, fire fighters, and other frontline defenders the resources they need to secure the home front. More than two years after 9/11, the list of urgent tasks not done is long and growing. It is still not clear, for example, who is in charge of domestic intelligence gathering, or whether we’re building the capacity we need to uncover terrorist plots in the United States. There’s still no national threat and vulnerability assessment to ensure we make the best use of our resources; the government’s 12 separate terrorist watch lists have yet to be integrated; and there is still too little effective information sharing between federal and state and local law enforcement agencies.

### ***Faltering Leadership Abroad***

President Bush speaks often of freedom and democracy, but in much of the world he lacks the moral authority to promote it. The gulf between his rhetoric and the reality of his policies is simply too glaring. From Pakistan to China to Russia, the administration has largely gone mute on democracy and human rights in order to hold on to the limited global support it has marshaled for the war on terrorism. In the Middle East, it has done too little to support those struggling against the forces of despotism, corruption, and violence in the Arab world. In Latin America, it undermined America’s credibility by toying with support for a coup in Venezuela. In Africa, except for a tardy intervention in Liberia,

it has offered little effective support for international efforts to end grave human rights abuses. Around the world, it has preached democratic standards and norms to others, while denying that those standards might bind America as well.

The United States today is also in danger of forfeiting world economic leadership. While preaching free trade abroad, the White House has failed to create the necessary preconditions at home for Americans to compete and thrive in a global economy. Since 2001, major trade initiatives have stalled and American exports dropped by \$90 billion, as the administration imposed new tariffs on everything from British steel to Vietnamese catfish, Salvadoran T-shirts and Canadian wood. The White House doubled farm subsidies, denying developing countries opportunities to export and grow, and undermining America’s credibility in the World Trade Organization. In response to the crippling financial instability and economic distress experienced by key Latin American partners, the administration contributed further to financial market uncertainty through feckless flip-flops on IMF lending and treatment of sovereign debt.

During the past three years the Bush administration has eroded the fundamental preconditions for sustained internationalism. It has unhitched foreign policy from American prosperity, destroying the domestic growth and fiscal balance that are essential for sustaining our engagement and leadership abroad. Across the board, the Republicans have sought security on the cheap, financing today’s military build-up with debts our children will bear, and funding other key priorities not at all. Finally, by turning foreign policy into a partisan wedge issue, the president and his advisors are recklessly undermining the bipartisan foundation that supported our success in the Cold War.

# PROGRESSIVE INTERNATIONALISM: A DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE

Democrats can and do offer a better way. Our progressive internationalism encompasses six core priorities:

1. Advance democracy abroad to make us safer at home
2. Prevent terrorists and dangerous regimes from acquiring weapons of mass destruction
3. Plug gaps in homeland defense
4. Transform the U.S. military and use it more effectively
5. Reinvigorate America's strategic alliances
6. Restore American global economic leadership

## ***1. Advance Democracy Abroad—Including the Islamic World***

Fashioned by Democrats but sustained until recently by a sturdy bipartisan consensus, America's internationalist strategy has safeguarded our interests while changing the world for the better. The spread of democracy over the past century, and especially since 1989, has brought greater freedom and self-rule to hundreds of millions. It is no accident that the security threats we face today arise exclusively from outside this enlarged community of liberal democracies. History shows that liberal democracies do not wage wars on each other; nor do they suffer famines or genocidal conflicts. While not all dictatorships are foes of the United States, every foe of the United States—from North Korea to Iran to Cuba—is a dictatorship.

Governments that behave responsibly at home and are accountable to their own people are more likely to behave responsibly abroad. Democratic regimes are more transparent, which makes them more predictable and less able to hide hostile activities, such as the production of weapons of mass destruction for rogue regimes or terrorists.

Democrats therefore will redouble efforts to encourage Russia and China to pursue political and economic liberalization, while speaking out against violations of human rights in these and other countries. We will push for broader political participation by women, trade unions, entrepreneurs, political parties, and other voices that are too often suppressed. We will make foreign assistance a strategic tool in the war on terrorism, for example, by helping countries set up public schools as an alternative to the *madrassas* that indoctrinate young men into jihad—and exclude girls altogether. Although we remain committed to using foreign aid to alleviate the misery of poverty and famine, we must also better tailor our assistance to reward nations that show a real commitment to openness, political reform, and fighting corruption.

For Democrats, the transformation of the greater Middle East—the vast arc of turmoil stretching from Northern Africa to Afghanistan—is a central challenge of our times. Nowhere is a fundamental shift in Western strategy more

necessary if we are to confront the forces that create the dangerous nexus between terrorism, failed states, rogue regimes, and mass destruction weapons. Such a shift requires ending the double standard that has led this and past administrations to downplay or ignore the pursuit of democracy and human rights in the region for the sake of a spurious “stability.” That policy has led us into a strategic dead end and it is time to put America squarely on the side of building human rights, civil liberties, and market reforms not just in rogue states like Iran and Syria but also in so-called “moderate” countries like Saudi Arabia and Egypt.

This will require dedicating more substantial resources, intellectual as well as financial, to support reform in the greater Middle East. Fifty years ago our leaders decided that the contest with communism required the training of a new generation of diplomats, scholars, and warriors to come up with the best ideas on how to defeat the Soviet threat. Today we need a similar commitment to generate the expertise, ideas, and policies to spur processes of reform and modernization throughout the Middle East. Now, as then, the United States should support people struggling to build an independent civil society, while orchestrating international pressure on ruling elites to reform. Democrats also believe America must not waver in its determination to help Iraqis establish a decent, representative government in Baghdad, which could inspire and encourage democratic reformers elsewhere in the region. In this, we simply cannot afford to fail.

---

*America must not waver in its determination to help Iraqis establish a decent, representative government in Baghdad, which could inspire and encourage democratic reformers elsewhere in the region.*

---

Democrats will work tirelessly to forge a peace that gives Israelis security and Palestinians dignity. We have learned from hard experience that if Arabs and Israelis are not negotiating, they are fighting, and that the only country that can move the peace process forward is the United States. Democrats repeatedly have shown that progress, and peace, can be made in the Middle East. Presidents Carter and

Clinton, respectively, brokered the Egyptian-Israeli and Jordanian-Israeli peace treaties. During the Clinton years, we came within a hair's breadth of making peace between Israel and the Palestinians at Camp David and Taba, and between Israel and Syria at Shepherdstown and Geneva. Democrats understand that winning the war against terrorism

and eradicating the other threats that America faces from the greater Middle East requires a successful peace process, and we have the skills, the experience, the desire, and the tenacity to make it work.

Finally, Democrats will adopt a crash program to reduce America's dependence on oil. This would reduce the leverage oil-rich Middle Eastern countries have over our foreign policy. But it would also encourage those countries to diversify and modernize their economies. Democrats would speed development and commercialization of new technologies and energy sources, such as hydrogen fuel cells. To reduce the amount of oil we have to import now, we will demand greater fuel efficiency and lower carbon emissions from today's vehicles—



including SUVs. And because we recognize that oil dependence and climate change aren't just American problems, but global problems, we will work with our allies and trade partners on common strategies for reducing our reliance on hydrocarbons and thereby promote a more stable and cleaner world.

## ***2. Prevent Terrorists and Dictators from Acquiring Weapons of Mass Destruction***

The first and most important line of defense in the age of terror is to prevent terrorists and dangerous tyrants from acquiring weapons of mass destruction (WMD) that they could use to attack or blackmail the United States and its allies. If during the Cold War we faced an arms race to build weapons, we are now in a race to keep them out of the wrong hands.

America must not tolerate North Korea's bid to mass-produce nuclear weapons. Democrats will pursue a collective approach that engages both the United Nations and North Korea's neighbors—Russia, China, Japan and South Korea—who have at least as large a stake as the United States in preventing nuclear proliferation in Northeast Asia. We will offer Pyongyang the prospect of better relations if North Korea agrees to go well beyond its past commitments, verifiably ending its development of nuclear weapons, addressing concerns about conventional military deployments, experimenting with markets as China has done, and beginning to open its closed society. At the same time, we will maintain a red line—making clear that if North Korea

resumes production of nuclear weapons, the United States would be prepared to use force to protect its interests.

Instead of relying only on military preemption of the *use* of WMD, Democrats would focus on preventing the *acquisition* of WMD. We will dramatically expand the successful Nunn-Lugar program, which has safeguarded nuclear materials and technologies in the former Soviet Union, by accelerating its pace, extending it to cover additional types of weapons,

and making it global in scope. We will dedicate America and its allies to the challenge of removing nuclear material entirely from the world's most vulnerable sites, destroying

remaining stocks of chemical weapons, and upgrading public health systems worldwide to deal with the threat of biological weapons.

## ***3. Plug Gaps in America's Homeland Defense***

On September 11, 2001, Americans learned a bitter lesson: Our unparalleled military may prevent other nations from attacking us, but it cannot deter global terror networks. Catastrophic terrorism is a means by which the weak can inflict horrendous damage on the strong. It demands a dual response: destroying terrorist havens abroad and mobilizing American ingenuity and resources to dramatically heighten our vigilance against attacks in our own homeland.

Democrats will bring an overdue sense of urgency to defending our homeland. We will not let bureaucratic inertia and turf-consciousness prevent

---

*America's armed forces are  
second to none—and we will  
keep them that way.*

---

us from creating America's first-ever domestic intelligence organization. We will junk the administration's farcical color-coded alert system and instead offer state and local leaders guidance based on a genuine threat assessment. We will conduct a top-to-bottom assessment of threats and key vulnerabilities and allocate dollars based on clear priorities rather than pork. We will merge watch lists and ensure that law enforcement agencies at every level are sharing information on suspected terrorist activities. We will spend what it takes to equip police, fire fighters and public health officials with the tools they need to protect their communities. We will harness new technologies that can detect biological, chemical and nuclear materials and help us to create "smart identification" systems that will make it harder for terrorists to enter or live in the United States. And we will raise our guard at home without violating Americans' basic civil liberties and right to privacy.

#### ***4. Transform the Military and Use it More Effectively***

Democrats are immensely proud of the skill, valor and professionalism our fighting men and women have shown in Afghanistan and Iraq. America's Armed Forces are second to none—and we will keep them that way.

We reject the left's perennial complaint

---

*Democrats will dismantle  
obsolete Cold War  
infrastructure, streamline the  
bloated defense bureaucracy,  
and end wasteful business  
practices to make room for  
investments that will sustain  
America's military superiority  
into the future.*

---

that America spends too much on the military. This is no time to cut the Pentagon's budget. But neither is it time to indulge the Republicans' habit of cutting the Pentagon blank checks. Rather than embrace the Bush administration's huge and unsustainable projected increases in military spending, Democrats will dismantle obsolete Cold War infrastructure, streamline the bloated defense bureaucracy, and end wasteful business practices to make room for investments that will sustain America's military superiority into the future. We will adopt new buying practices that strengthen the U.S. defense industry by bringing it into the commercial and technological mainstream. And we will speed the pace of military transformation to ensure that our forces will prevail over the unconventional threats future adversaries will likely pose, such as terrorism, trafficking in nuclear, biological and chemical materials and weapons, cyber-attacks, and attempts to deny U.S. forces access to places they need to go.

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have shown that we need to enhance our ability to project power with deadly accuracy over enormous distances. This means investing in "information dominance" through greater emphasis on fully networked information systems for command-and-control, communications, surveillance, intelligence, and reconnaissance; the next generation of precision munitions; unmanned aircraft and long-range bombers; light, mobile and more lethal ground forces, especially special operations; and on a new

generation of Naval vessels that can bring greater and more accurate firepower to distant theaters of conflict. It is also time to rethink the size and mix of our active and reserve forces, which have been stretched to the breaking point by our open-ended deployments in the greater Middle East.

Democrats recognize that a transformed military—and the willingness to use it—gives credibility to U.S. diplomacy. But when diplomacy fails, America must be ready to fight to protect its interests, advance its values, and maintain global order.

Yet Democrats also stand for a smarter approach to the use of American military power. When America goes to war, the size of the force and length of deployment should depend on the mission we send our troops to accomplish—and that includes building the kind of environment necessary to protect America's interests over the long term. When America wins a war, it should be ready to deploy forces to preserve order and security so that the threats we fight to eliminate do not return. In addition to keeping our military strong, Democrats will build rapidly deployable units, both civilian and military, that specialize in winning the peace after most of the shooting has stopped, such as reconstruction experts, police, intelligence, linguists, and civil affairs officers.

We will also press for an expanded NATO peacekeeping mission in Afghanistan, to help extend the authority of the Afghan government throughout the country, to provide security for

Afghan civilians and international reconstruction efforts, to challenge the writ of abusive warlords and to free U.S. forces to focus on their primary mission—destroying al Qaeda and the Taliban.

We will maintain a robust military presence in Iraq for as long as it takes to help that country achieve security and stability. But we will also not allow arrogance or ideology to stand in the way of forging a broad coalition to help America bear the burden of peacekeeping, governance and reconstruction in Iraq. We will solicit the participation of our allies and the United Nations as true partners in building a new Iraq, recognizing that those who share the risks of that endeavor must also be permitted to share some authority in shaping it.

When America fights and wins a war, we have a clear responsibility to help provide post-conflict security. We will train and equip both our military forces and civilian security personnel to maintain order until other forces—international, local, or both—are ready to take on that job. And we will level with the American people about the risks, costs, and duration of our military deployments, recognizing that dangers in the Middle East, Korea, Africa, and elsewhere may require us to undertake new missions in the years ahead.

## ***5. Reinvalidate America's Strategic Alliances***

From Harry Truman's creation of NATO in the late 1940s to Bill Clinton's enlargement of

---

*We should make it more attractive for foreign leaders to build alliances with us in the world than to build electoral campaigns at home premised on anti-Americanism.*

---

the Atlantic alliance in the 1990s, Democratic presidents have made America's strategic alliances a cornerstone of their foreign policy. Indeed, our alliances in Europe and Asia are one of the main reasons why the second half of the 20th century was so much more peaceful and secure than the first.

As the United States confronts the security challenges of the 21st century, Democrats are convinced that America's alliances are as important as ever. We intend to reinvigorate and reorient them to new challenges, not abandon them. Our guiding principle is "together when we can, alone when we must."

We see no contradiction between national strength and international cooperation. Democrats will endeavor to win friends to our side by the power of our arguments, not just the argument of our power. We will use our military alliances to share the burden of war-fighting and peacekeeping in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, instead of treating them as dispensable remnants of an earlier age. And we will reinvigorate our government's foreign affairs institutions, recognizing that America's diplomatic strategies must be as effective as our military strategies.

Democrats understand that working with alliances and international institutions is not a favor we do for the rest of the world. Our alliances and "first among equals" status in world bodies are tremendous strategic assets. They extend our reach, amplify our voice and help to

legitimate America's leadership and actions. Our allies supported U.S. efforts around the world because they valued our support in crises that affected them and because we worked hard to take their views and concerns into consideration when we acted. Taking a purely instrumental approach to alliances—assuming that you can put together coalitions on the fly to deal with events

as they come up—has left us touting the contributions of Palau and Micronesia to the invasion of Iraq, while countries who could make real contributions, like France and Germany, stand in opposition.

We also understand that reinvigorated alliances require an effort to address the problems

that are of mutual concern to our allies and ourselves, even when those problems may not be our top security priority. By providing leadership on such global challenges as climate change, poverty and immunizations, we not only express America's best values and instincts, but also make it more attractive and politically sustainable for friendly countries to work cooperatively with us on our top security priorities, such as combating terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. We should make it more attractive for foreign leaders to build alliances with us in the world than to build electoral campaigns at home premised on anti-Americanism.

NATO, our most important and successful alliance, has new and vital roles to play in underpinning Western security. An enlarged and modernized NATO can help to anchor

---

*We will resume efforts,  
abandoned under this  
administration, to manage the  
inexorable advance of  
globalization and ensure that the  
spread of commerce is matched  
by rising living standards for the  
world's poor.*

---



democracy in neighboring countries like Ukraine, isolate the last totalitarian dictatorship in Belarus, and hold out the prospect of a strategic partnership with an evolving Russia. But even more important is the need to refocus NATO on the challenge of transforming the greater Middle East. The challenges we face there will require years if not decades of sustained cooperation in a multitude of areas ranging from homeland security and combating weapons of mass destruction to democracy promotion and nation-building.

Finally, Democrats will work to reform and strengthen the United Nations and other multinational institutions. We have no illusions about their current shortcomings. We recognize, for example, that international law is not self-enforcing and that international institutions only work when leading powers share an interest in making them work. At the same time, we believe that America has a vital national interest in promoting and respecting global rules that reflect and help institutionalize the values we share with people throughout the world.

## ***6. Restore U.S. Economic Leadership***

Democrats have a long and distinguished tradition of advancing prosperity at home and abroad as a key component of our national security. In the 1940s, Franklin Roosevelt helped to create the modern institutions of international finance, and Harry Truman launched the world trading system. Five decades later, Bill Clinton led the most comprehensive strengthening of the global economic system in modern times, passing NAFTA, creating the World Trade Organization (WTO), forging landmark international agreements in high tech sectors, crafting effective responses to financial

crises in Mexico and Asia, reshaping our economic relationship with Africa and normalizing trade relations with China. The results speak for themselves: a strengthened trading system abroad, more stable relations among the world's great powers and the creation of 21 million jobs and unprecedented economic growth at home, which made the American people more willing to bear the costs of international engagement.

To restore U.S. leadership in the global economy, we must restore the dynamism of the American economy by forswearing the Bush administration's policies of fiscal recklessness. We must restore American leadership following the collapse in Cancun of the Doha WTO round and the loss of momentum on the Free Trade Area of the Americas; renew and expand trade relations with Africa and least developed countries like Cambodia; and bring Russia into the world trading system. We will resume efforts, abandoned under this administration, to manage the inexorable advance of globalization and ensure that the spread of commerce is matched by rising living standards for the world's poor. To that end, we favor reforming multilateral lending institutions to tackle corruption and poverty more vigorously, lifting labor and environmental standards around the world, and raising the U.S. profile in the fight against child labor and the subordination of women.

In an age marked by greater economic turbulence and insecurity, the United States must play a more active role in international efforts to stabilize world financial flows and reduce global poverty. More energetic U.S. leadership is also required to combat the global pandemic of HIV/AIDS and other

infectious diseases ravaging the developing world.

As our military, intelligence and diplomacy attack terrorist groups and their leaders head-on, America must also marshal an intelligent and coherent program to deprive them of recruits. Among the necessary instruments here is a fundamentally new approach to trade and economic relations with the Muslim world.

Since 1980, the Middle East's share of global trade and investment has collapsed, falling by 75 percent even as the region's population has almost doubled. Today, the entire Muslim world,

with its 57 countries and 1.3 billion people, receives barely more foreign investment each year than tiny Sweden all by itself. The combination of rising population and vanishing opportunity creates a vast pool of angry, directionless young people: a natural audience for radicals, anti-Americans, and fundamentalists. A new trade preference program for the Muslim world, as proposed by Senators Baucus (D-Mont.) and McCain (R-Ariz.), and Representatives Smith (D-Wash.) and Dooley (D-Calif.), followed by a concerted effort to deepen the region's economic integration more broadly, can help restore growth and confidence to the region.

## CONCLUSION

In the coming national election, Democrats must offer the American people a clear choice on national security. The party that led America out of isolation in the 20th century is prepared to lead America out of unilateralism in the 21st century. We are confident that a new Democratic strategy, grounded in the party's tradition of muscular internationalism,

can keep Americans safer than the Republicans' go-it-alone policy, which has alienated our natural allies and overstretched our resources. We aim to rebuild the moral foundation of U.S. global leadership by harnessing America's awesome power to universal values of liberal democracy. A new progressive internationalism can point the way.



[http://www.ppionline.org/specials/security\\_strategy](http://www.ppionline.org/specials/security_strategy)